

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of the above referenced application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 are currently pending in the present application. Claims 1-9 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claim 10 is amended to more clearly define the present invention and to include the limitation that dust and odor are removed from the raw material by the action of the scrubbers in the ventilation system of the invention prior to drying the raw material. The specification and claims as originally filed fully support the amendment to Claim 10. Particular support is found in the specification at page 3, line 20 to page 4, line 2. Support is also found at page 5, lines 3-11 and in Figures 1 and 2. No new matter has been added.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Girovich (U.S. Patent 5,215,670). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

The present invention as now defined is a poultry litter fertilizer manufacturing system, which includes a raw material ventilation system having a scrubber for treating air by removing poultry litter raw material dust and odor from the air prior to passing the ventilated raw material to a dryer system. Unlike conventional litter processing plants, the present invention recognizes the problem that much of the air exiting a litter processing plant contains dust and odors, which originate from the raw litter material that is introduced into the plant before drying, pelletizing and other processing takes place. For this reason, Applicant has provided in the claimed invention, a ventilation system, which includes a scrubber, for removal of dust and odor generated by the raw material itself. This dust removal and deodorizing of the raw material serves to dramatically decrease the air borne dust and odors as compared to conventional litter

processing plants that only attempt to treat the air released after the plant processing steps of drying and pelletizing, and the like. In the present invention, after the raw material has been treated by the claimed ventilation system for removal of dust and odors, the ventilated material is then treated by the dryer system to form a pasteurized dried material. This dried material is then reduced to a powder and provided to a pelleting system, which produces granular and homogenized pellets from the powder.

Unlike the present invention, Girovich discloses a device and process in which “Dewatered municipal sludge is dried and simultaneously pelletized in an indirect dryer.” (Abstract). As clearly shown in the Girovich figures, which were referenced in the present rejection (Figure 1, references 13-17 and Figure 2, reference 111), and described in the accompanying portion of the Girovich specification, the system of Girovich does not provide a raw material scrubber for the removal of dust and odor prior to passing the raw material to a dryer system, as is required by the Applicant’s claimed invention.

In contrast, Girovich, as shown in Figure 1 and described at Col. 3 and 4, discloses a system for providing dewatered sludge directly to a dryer (1) having a rotating drum heated up to 800° F. The rotating drum 101 is equipped with flights 102, “which enhance the pellets cascading and showering” within the rotating drum 101. “The dried product exists the dryer via a stationary discharge hood 110 ...” (Col. 4, lines 8-10). As shown in Figure 1, there is no provision made for a raw material ventilation system in the device of Girovich. The dried material discharged from the dryer (1) of Girovich is passed to a “screen” (7) and then to a “crusher” (8) or a “pellet cooler” (9) but not to a ventilation system. Only the exhaust gases and water vapor from the dryer (1), after being pulled by a fan into a condenser (11) is treated by a scrubber (13) for cleaning and cooling. This inclusion of a scrubber (13), which is used by Girovich to prepare dryer exhaust air for further use as a fuel supplement for that same dryer is

certainly not a ventilation system for removing dust and odor from raw litter material prior to the raw litter material being introduced into a dryer. As shown above, Girovich does not teach or suggest each and every element of the invention as claimed and therefore does not anticipate the Applicant's invention.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present rejection is overcome. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 10-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Maffet (U.S. Patent 4,193,206). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection.

Maffet does not teach or suggest the use of a raw material ventilation system for removing dust and odors from the air. Maffet is directed to a process for drying and granulating sewage sludge. As disclosed a Col. 7, lines 31-53, Maffet discloses a process whereby organic wastes are first treated by a thermal dryer, either direct or indirect. The effluent stream produced from the thermal dryer of Maffet produces off-gases, which are separated from solids by one or more cyclone separators having a wet scrubber (Col. 8, lines 46-58). These "filtered off-gases" are finally passed through an odor scrubber (Col. 8, lines 61-63). Maffet makes no mention of any need to provide a raw material ventilation system for removing dust and odor from the raw material prior to drying or further treating the sewage material. Maffet only provides a deodorizing treatment for the filter off-gases produced by a cyclone separator, which has earlier separated off-gases from the dried waste, which was previously dried by the thermal dryer. Maffet makes no suggestion that the quality of the air emitted from a litter processing plant can be improved by using a ventilation system with a scrubber to treat raw litter material prior to drying that material. This required element of the Applicant's claimed invention is not taught or

suggested by the disclosure of Maffet.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully asserts that the present rejection is overcome.
Withdrawal of the rejection is requested.


CONCLUSION

In light of the above, Applicant believes that this application is now in condition for allowance and therefore requests favorable consideration.

If any points remain in issue which the Examiner feels may be best resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP



Steven B. Kelber
Registration No. 30,073
Attorney of Record

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085

Perry E. Van Over
Registration No. 42,197